

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/713,355

Applicant(s)

TABATA ET AL.

Examiner

Tu M. Nguyen

Art Unit

3748

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tu M. Nguyen (examiner).

(3) _____.

(2) Thomas G. Bilodeau (attorney).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 June 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 12, and 13.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kobayashi et al. (EP Application 1,174,600 A2).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argues that Kobayashi et al. do not interrupt the SOx purge of the catalyst in order to regenerate the particulate filter. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner will carefully review all arguments in an amendment when formally submitted.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Tu M. Nguyen
Examiner's signature, if required